

Meeting Minutes
Child Development Policy Advisory Committee
December 5, 2002

Welcome, Introductions and Committee Business

Kathy Malaske-Samu welcomed everyone and began the meeting with introductions of the committee and audience members. She welcomed the students from Ponderosa High School and wished them an enjoyable day in the Capitol. She encouraged them to learn about early care and education and consider working in the child care field as they progress in their education.

The November meeting minutes were unanimously approved.

Director's Report

Kay Ryan reported that the new Legislature was sworn in on Monday.

The other big news in Sacramento is the budget. On Tuesday, Governor Davis signed an Executive Order calling the Legislature into a special session starting Monday. Tomorrow, he plans to release details of his proposal for mid-year cuts and has asked the Legislature to take action on the proposals by the end of January.

The Governor's proposals will not include tax increases but that does not preclude Legislators from introducing them. Senator Burton has said we can expect that both tax and fee increases will be introduced in an effort to close what seems to be an ever-expanding shortfall. The Governor said on Tuesday that he expects the deficit to be substantially larger than the LAO's \$21.1 billion estimate and numbers as high as \$30 billion are being projected when the 2002-03 gap is included.

A number of bills that will be of interest to the Committee were introduced on Monday. SB 6, SB 7 and AB 56, which all propose to implement pieces of the California Master Plan for Education would shift management of public schools from the Superintendent of Public Instruction to the Secretary of Education; establish Universal Preschool; and make Kindergarten mandatory. Other related bills are expected to be introduced during the next several months.

Another bill CDPAC will follow is SB 14. This bill would establish the Early Childhood Education and After School Facilities Program Act of 2003. It would provide funding to establish safe and educationally appropriate facilities for early care and education and after-school care, and the Early Childhood Facilities Loan Act of 2003, which would provide loans to qualifying applicants for the purpose of expanding and improving licensed child care homes. The Act includes a bond measure to go before the voters during the next statewide election. CDPAC meetings and web site will provide information on these bills and the budget as things progress.

The LPC conference is going to be the best ever. We have an amazing line-up of top-notch people who are going to inspire and guide us to keep moving forward to realize our vision for the children of this great state and help us figure out how to keep today's fiscal challenges from diminishing the future of our next generation. Mark your calendars – February 19 and 20th at the Downtown Sheraton. Be there or be square.

Kathy asked if there were any comments, questions or public announcements. Hearing none, she then invited the first presentation.

Moving Toward More Inclusive Child Care: Report on the Transfer of Knowledge Symposium

Marie Poulsen, Cheri Schoenborn, Panel of Local Planners

Marie began by thanking the staff and all of the others for their work in putting together such a wonderful and overwhelmingly successful experience. Teams from 51 Counties – more than 400 people – attended the TOK Symposium. The goal, to bring together members of the child care and early intervention communities around inclusive child care, was more than realized. The symposium brought together over 100 representatives of Local Child Care Planning Councils, Resource and Referral Agencies, Resource Centers and Provider Associations and an equal number of people representing Regional Centers, Early Start Programs, Family Resource Centers and other programs serving children with disabilities. It was a huge step forward for California.

Cheri provided an overview of the presentations and flow of the day. She described how the presentations built upon one another. First, by giving participants information about the population of children with disabilities and other special needs and the legal requirements for providing services. Also compelling was the powerful re-enactment of the frustration families experience in dealing with multiple service sectors when seeking child care for their child with a disability. Many thanks to the script writer and the resourceful volunteers.

Local Planning Council representatives then described how the TOK supported local efforts to develop more inclusive child care. Kathi Walker, the Local Child Care Planning Council Coordinator from El Dorado County, reported that a team had already come together in El Dorado and had gotten together as a group to meet each other and talk about what they wanted to achieve. She said that the symposium enabled them to set goals, provided data they could analyze that was not previously available, and important information about the resources that exist. She said the most important result was the trust that was built.

Marilyn Rotnem, the Local Child Care Planning Coordinator from Merced County said that the symposium was most important and helpful in getting people together from the different disciplines to focus on this issue. Additionally, the resources were extremely useful as were the connections that were made. She said that it helped to create a sustainable movement within the county.

Marcia Westbrook, Coordinator of the Child Care Coordinating Council of Nevada County said their county scheduled a follow-up meeting for December 16th to review the plan and create solutions. She said that each member present at the TOK was reaching out to invite other interested members in the community to the meeting.

Francine Nunes, Coordinator of the Placer County Child Care Advisory Council said the TOK and the emphasis on inclusive child care helped to generate interest on the part of their Children & Families Commission. She anticipates that they will collaborate to achieve the goal of more inclusive child care in Placer County.

Cheri asked Ed Condon to speak on what he had heard from the Head Start representatives who attended the Symposium. He said he had not heard much but had a question regarding whether the event was equally helpful in more urban counties. Joyce Stone, Coordinator of the Sacramento County Local Child Care Planning and Development Council was recruited from the audience to provide the urban perspective.

Ms. Stone said the symposium enabled Sacramento County to expand on the work that had been started by a committee of the LPC and develop the plan for the SB 1703 grant. The work includes the development of a survey of providers on their experiences caring for children with special needs. They have hired a coordinator, who is now conducting interviews with key contacts in the community, starting with direct service providers, such as Alta Regional Center and WarmLine. In addition, Linda Brault, who was a major player in the TOK, will give the keynote address at the 19th Annual Child Care Awards dinner on April 10th in an effort to spread the message of inclusion in all of the work with the child care community.

Kathy Malaske-Samu spoke on Los Angeles County. She said they already had a committee working on the issues for children with special needs, and the difficult part was selecting only 9 members to attend the symposium. She said her team was really energized by working together in a room filled with other people from other counties all giving this issue their full attention. Los Angeles is one of many counties that planned a follow-up meeting to inform those that could not attend about the work that was done and enlist their support in moving the agenda forward for inclusive child care throughout California.

It was suggested that CDPAC staff explore venues for getting information about on the TOK process and results. Staff indicated that a state-level follow-up meeting would be held in the Spring. We also welcome other opportunities to keep the issue of inclusive child care in the forefront so that we can continue building on all the good work that has been done and expand the child care options for children with disabilities and other special needs. This issue is also one the Federal Government has identified as a priority for the coming months.

Boundless Playgrounds

Tiffany Harris, Brad Thornton, Shane's Inspiration

Ms. Harris is the Co-founder and Executive Director of Shane's Inspiration In Los Angeles. Shane's Inspiration is a non-profit organization committed to the creation of universally accessible, sensory-rich, developmentally appropriate, fun, safe and challenging playgrounds where children of all abilities can play together at their highest level of ability. Shane's Inspiration builds environments that allow children with disabilities to really play with their able-bodied peers and siblings. She showed a video about the playgrounds.

Currently, public playgrounds are physically inaccessible for children with disabilities. This segregates disabled children from their friends and siblings and inhibits their ability to develop vital, early childhood skills. Many "accessible" playgrounds require children in wheelchairs to remove themselves from their wheelchairs and drag themselves along the play scape to play.

Shane's Inspiration created the largest Boundless Playground in the United States. It is a \$1 million, two-acre, universally accessible playground in Griffith Park in Los Angeles. It opened in September 2000, and has received the Architectural Landscape Design Award from the L.A. Business Council, the Award of Excellence for Facility Design/Special Purpose from the California Parks and Recreation Society and the L.A. Parent Award for Outstanding Playground. Since 1998, when Shane's Inspiration was founded, they have raised over \$2 million and initiated 26 Boundless Playground projects.

In this past year, Shane's Inspiration created a Community Outreach and Public Education Program, which has increased the use of the playgrounds while building public awareness of the benefits of integrated play for both disabled and able-bodied children and their families. Outreach activities include: a free bussing program that brings 3,500 children annually to existing playgrounds; public speaking engagements at local schools, Regional Centers, hospitals and communities; newsletters, hospital research collaborations; and the development of a school-based education program to increase awareness among able-bodied children and teachers.

Ms. Harris showed a video, which demonstrated clearly the benefits of Boundless Playgrounds for all children. The mission is to put a playground within reach of every child with disability. The standard is that 70 percent of the playground must be accessible and playable – must be just as fun and exciting for able-bodied children – must serve all abilities and all disabilities. They welcome partnerships with the child development community to benefit from our vast knowledge of how children play. It is difficult to build in public places because of the regulations and requirements that limit closed spaces that might benefit children with autism. Shane's Inspiration has pushed the envelope and built a plane with very high walls that slows the stimulation and allows play for children who are easily over stimulated.

Brad Thornton, Director of Project Development, described their work with school districts, including the L.A. Unified. And agencies that work with children with disabilities. Transportation is a huge issue due to the high insurance rates required to transport children, especially those with disabilities. They have also developed partnerships with individual schools and foundations, including the Ann and Kirk Douglas Foundation and are hopeful that Measure K will build 80 new schools in Los Angeles and as many boundless playgrounds. When talking about boundless playgrounds, often they think that just getting to the playground is enough; but need to increase awareness that the playground must also allow children to play.

Ms. Harris shared letters from children that indicate they have increased their understanding and acceptance of children with disabilities. She reminded people that when they think about building playgrounds, they should know that ADA standards do not equate with accessibility for all children.

Q. Bob Bates – How much of the playground is standard or off-the-shelf that can be adapted and how much must be actually created?

The goal is to ensure that these playgrounds become the standard; take typical manufactured equipment and reconfigure – i.e., decks wider, panels wider, etc. However, in addition to modifying typical equipment to make it accessible to all children, Shane's Inspiration holds dream meetings where kids get to imagine the playground they want. One of the features in the video was actually the idea of a child. We must educate the manufacturers and create enough of a demand that it becomes cost effective for them to build in this way.

Q. Evelyn Mason - How are you using the high school students who come to the playground?

A. We started Shane's Club. Once a month we sponsor trips to the playground and many activities i.e., face painting, entertainment, etc., which involve the older children.

Cheri Schoenborn – In California there is a Family Resource Center Network that provides services and support to families of children with disabilities. This will be a great resource to you and you can get more information about them through Kay.

Bonnie Parks – I would like to get you information on the Governor's Committee for the Disabled. That too will be a good resource for you.

CalWORKs Time Limits

Maria Hernandez, CDSS; Scott Graves, California Budget Project

Venus Garth introduced Maria Hernandez, who is the Chief of the CalWORKs Eligibility Bureau. Ms. Hernandez will address the issue of time limits for CalWORKs recipients, which came up at a previous meeting. Ms. Garth arranged this presentation to address the Committee's questions.

Maria said that the TANF program (formerly known as AFDC) has a total lifetime limit for adults of five years. California actually added a year to the federal time limits, so that many families who would have timed out under federal regulations were actually allowed an extra year. The first of those families will hit the time limits in January 2003. She clarified that these limits only pertain to the adults in the household. Any children in the household will continue to receive cash aid as long as they meet the requirements to receive aid and families will continue to receive Food Stamps and Medi-Cal for which they are eligible.

It is estimated that approximately 93,000 cases, or 106,000 adults will come up against time limits in January 2003 and an additional 18,000 cases will reach their limit each month thereafter. Some counties will continue to offer work assistance and job retention services to those individuals that are off aid for up to two years.

About a year ago, the Department of Social Services looked at a large database of TANF recipients and took a snapshot of long-term recipients. They found that long-term welfare recipient families have more working adults, larger families, are older, have less education, and speak languages other than English. Local County surveys mirror these statistics.

The DSS and Counties have been working for some time to remind families of their time limits and inform them about the date their cash aid will end and criteria for exemptions for which they may be eligible. Because there are circumstances that may have resulted in families being excluded for periods of time during the five years, the Department is relying on exemption data that counties have provided via an automated system. Fifty-four counties have fully converted their data to this automated system, which will assist in the computation of individual case information.

The Department also continues to offer guidance to counties in moving families off of services when their time limit is up. This includes forums and training sessions to provide technical information to service providers, protocols for screening people with long-term with physical and mental disabilities, limited English proficiency and substance abuse issues.

A survey of Counties indicates that some will continue to provide case management to assist families from welfare to work and will offer support for a short term after the time limits if the individual is still unemployed. Others will conduct home visits to identify barriers and utilize a multidisciplinary approach to assist families. Although we won't know the effects of the time limit until it happens, it is anticipated that most families will continue to be in the system by virtue of the children's continuing eligibility.

Evelyn Mason expressed concern on behalf of the relatives and grandparents who are worried that with the reduced assistance they will have to support their grandchildren and possibly their children.

Q. Kathy Malaske-Samu asked what impact we could expect to see on eligibility for child care services.

A. Ms. Garth said that we won't see any immediate impact as child care has been fully funded for the current year and most children will still meet eligibility for child care.

Q. Earl Peterson asked for more information about the kinds of exemptions that stop the time clock for people.

A. Maria passed out a handout reviewing the types of exemptions available and what the requirements would be to be eligible for them.

Evelyn told of a grandparent that was concerned that her grandchild was not seeking work assistance because she did not know how to fill out the forms and thought she would be receiving an exemption at the end of her limit. She was also concerned that many of the young adults receiving assistance did not understand the kind of assistance they were receiving. She recommended that a focus be made to inform parents and grandparents how to assist their children.

Q. Karen Adams from Welfare Action asked about the 60-day eligibility for child care beyond termination of CalWORKs and the effective date the two-year post CalWORKs eligibility for child care begins if the parent is not using child care on the date their cash aid ends but begins to utilize the services in the following month. Ed Condon asked about the potential for families to lose Head Start eligibility based on losing TANF eligibility.

A. Maria said that when a parent is removed from a grant, the child is still eligible for a cash grant so the child would still be eligible for Head Start. They wouldn't technically be TANF recipients but would still be part of California's CalWORKs program and the State would be picking up the child's eligibility. Kathy asked staff to work with CDE, Head Start and Region IX to clarify what the impact will be on Head Start eligibility.

Q. Deana Carrillo from the California Budget Project asked if CalWORKs Stage 3 will be on the chopping block for the mid-year reductions.

A. Venus replied that Stage 3 is currently fully funded for this fiscal year. Both Ms. Garth and Mr. Jett said they believe there is enough funding for this fiscal year and don't anticipate changes.

Scott Graves from the California Budget Project introduced himself and said he appreciated being added to the agenda at the last moment. He said he is working on a report regarding time limits and the expected impact in California. He believes that there will be significantly fewer adults reaching time limits than estimated by CDSS. He also said it appears that many families are realizing that these time limits for assistance are real and are removing themselves and sometimes their children from assistance. He said they agree with the Department's assessment of the characteristics of those

individuals meeting their time limits. He said many of the counties offer assistance to individuals receiving aid only if they are working when their limit is up. Other counties are not offering any assistance at all due to lack of funding.

Kathy said it would be interesting to see the estimated percent of time limits as compared to the actual number. She also thanked the members of the Legislature and their Staff that were in attendance and said the afternoon session would be start off with questions and comments.

Welcome to Legislative Staff/State Department Reports

Kathy welcomed everyone back from lunch and said the part of the meeting was to provide an overview of various child care topics for Legislative staff and welcomed staff from Assembly Member Hannah-Beth Jackson's office

Child Care as Child Development, Kathy Malaske-Samu

Quality child care programs provide the atmosphere children need to learn and grow. Where a child care center will have children napping after lunch on cots or mats and at home these children may be napping in their beds, the only difference may be that at the center they are in a group of children napping. She talked about how children need to play and be active to learn and many adults forget this. Quality child care programs, be they center-based or in families are based on meeting the needs of children in safe and developmentally appropriate settings. We must not forget that kids need to play, run, jump, make mud and just explore.

Child Care as Child Abuse Prevention, Kay Ryan

In California, there were 671,422 reports of abuse last year. About a quarter (133,687) of the children were under the age of five. Although the number of reports climbs each year, the percentage of young children is down from years past. Infants and young children are at higher risk of serious injury and suffer the highest incidence of death from abuse. In addition to being less mobile and less able to protect themselves, they may go unnoticed by their community until they reach school age.

Child care providers can play a crucial role in protecting children from abuse. They may be the first to recognize signs of abuse, neglect or family dysfunction by virtue of the fact that they interact with young children and their families more often and more consistently than any other professionals. All licensed child care providers are mandated reporters. They are required by law to report abuse to a child protective agency and about one-half of all reports are made by mandated reporters. Although anyone who has ever filed a CPS report can tell you that it's not an easy thing to do, it can be especially difficult for family child care providers who lack the organizational structure to support and insulate them.

Children who are referred by Child Welfare Services, or by a qualified professional in a legal, medical or social service agency, or emergency shelter – have first priority for state and federally-subsidized child care. This policy resulted from a 1976 pilot project that documented success in keeping families together.

It was only a few years after that when I first met a child who was receiving child care through a CPS referral. His name was Adam and aside from wearing a helmet because of a seizure disorder, he appeared to be typically developing. Each day, this program, which was specifically for children at risk of abuse, would pick him up first thing in the morning, bring him to the center and after a full day, drive him home. Adam's Mother, although not what we might think of when we think of "abusive" had an IQ of about 70 and was "non-verbal."

There is no doubt that the child care environment where Adam spent his days is the reason he went to public school at age five, it's the reason he grew up with his own Mother who very clearly loved him, and is probably the reason he graduated from High School and is a productive member of society today.

Many positive outcomes result from providing quality child care to children at risk of abuse and/or neglect. An environment that was chaotic is now more structured; time trying not to wake a sleeping parent is now replaced with stimulating activities; children learn alternative ways of behaving and reacting; they learn about routine and following directions.

Child care provides parents with temporary respite and the opportunity to manage their stressful life circumstances and comply with the requirements of their case plan, which may include counseling, alcohol and drug treatment or parenting classes. At the same time, child care provides children with a safe and stable environment within which they can engage in developmentally appropriate activities that promote their healthy physical, emotional and social development. Child care professionals often become mentors for parents and can help them understand their child's behavior and model techniques for interacting in positive ways.

Charley is an example of how it can work. In Charley's world the word "terrorism" has a meaning all it's own. He had been watching cartoons when the pictures of the planes exploding and buildings crumbling were flashed over and over on the TV screen. When he ran to his Mother's room for comfort, she was crying again and his angry Father chased him out, yelling and threatening to hurt him. Charley hid behind the sofa, as he always did. Even though he is only five years old, Charley has been terrorized since infancy by violence in his own home.

Shortly after that day, Charley and his Mom began going to Children's Institute International (CII). They met with a counselor in a child-friendly therapy room. There his Mother felt free to talk about her problems and so did Charley. Soon they were both coming to CII every week – his Mom to meet in a group of women who had also experienced domestic violence, and Charley to participate in a program with other children, learning how to play cooperatively and resolve differences peacefully and talk to a counselor who seemed to know just what he was thinking and feeling. In time both Charley and his Mom began to feel better. Recently, with the help of the friendly counselors at CII, Charley and his Mom moved into a new home – just the two of them.

Within this past year, and with the help of loving and consistent care, Charley has changed from a terrified and potentially violent child to a happier little boy who can now play with his classmates and focus on his schoolwork.

There are many examples of how child care was THE service that enabled a troubled or fragile family to stay together while working through major challenges. Unfortunately, there are many kids in foster care because this kind of support was not available to their family.

The cost of providing ongoing child care and development services to children under five is minimal when compared to the long-term costs associated with case management and foster care.

Some of the issues regarding child care as child abuse prevention are:

- ★ We don't know how many kids or what percentage of the eligible population receives child care or respite as part of a CWS case plan. Several years ago, the Legislative Analyst's Office set the figure at less than 5 percent of those who are eligible. (Actual numbers are unknown due to the way data are reported.)
- ★ Reimbursement, although slightly higher, doesn't adequately cover costs associated with working with parents, maintaining contact with the case worker and linking families with other services.
- ★ Continuity of care may be jeopardized when the CWS case is closed or the child is placed in foster care.
- ★ Some states draw down Federal IVE funds to continue child care for children in foster care. This provides continuity for the children but is viewed as duplicative in California.

The Irvine Child Care Project, Earl Peterson

Earl talked about a model for after-school child care in the City of Irvine. When this project was conceived, survey data showed that approximately 77 percent of families in the city needed care for their school-age children and the city provided none. The Irvine Child Care Project (ICCP) was created to provide quality, affordable school-age child care through community-based, non-profit organizations located on elementary school sites. It was created through a Joint Powers Agreement between the City of Irvine and the Irvine Unified School District. It is maintained by a Board of Directors, which includes: a representative from the Board of the Irvine Unified School District, a member of the City Council, a City Employee, an employee of the school district and a community member.

Their goal was to raise money to create 20 sites for child care services. That goal has been met and exceeded. Today the project and the Irvine Children's Fund provides for the rehabilitation and ongoing maintenance of sites. It selects non-profit organizations

to operate the child care programs and assures that State-funded child care services meet the needs of low-income families. It offers scholarships for qualifying families; disseminates information to the community about the services provided; and, assures program quality through regularly-scheduled program reviews. The standards set for participating programs are higher than those set by the state and all projects are reviewed each year.

The ICCP is an example of a public-private partnership that is working to meet the need for quality child care for low-income families. It could be a model for other communities. It now includes an athletic sporting event that allows the kids to enjoy themselves while raising money for the program. Teachers who enter teams are reimbursed for the extra time it takes to coach the teams and prepare them to participate. This year the plan is to get every school in Irvine into this project.

The Economic Impact of Child Care, Bonnie Parks

Bonnie said much of the information she is going to relate is from the National Economic Development and Law Center's (NEDLC) Report featured at a CDPAC meeting last year. She thanked Brentt Brown who was present for all the hard work NEDLC did on this issue. The licensed child care industry generates between \$4.7 and \$5.4 billion a year in gross receipts, which puts it on par with California's major agricultural sectors, making it similar in size to both the livestock and vegetable crops industry. It surpasses many other high profile industries such as sporting goods; household supplies and appliances; and the women's clothing industry.

Stable child care enables California's working parents to earn at least \$13 billion dollars annually. It is a high source for tax revenue and supports an estimated 1.1 million jobs.

The licensed child care industry directly employs over 123,000 people in California. This industry creates and sustains three times more employees than the state's advertising industry, over two times more employees than the lumber industry, and several thousand more than the accounting and legal services industries. In addition, jobs are generated indirectly through the goods and services the industry and its employees purchase.

When the economy improves there will be a higher need for child care, but there will not be enough child care providers. Child care jobs often serve as a stepping stone to higher income through the possibility of being a future teacher. The state will need to fill over 300,000 teacher positions in the next ten years and the Employment Development Department views the child care field as an essential pool for filling those jobs as many early care providers go on to obtain their teaching credentials. Child care jobs fit the ABCs of job placement: A- get a job, B- get a better job, and C- get a career.

According to an article in the Wall Street Journal, families are increasingly becoming "child care poor" as the cost of child care is rising at more than twice the consumer price inflation rate. Child care is important to the State as an economic engine. It is important to families in general and is important in enabling welfare families to work.

Early Intervention, Cheri Schoenborn

Early Start is California's system of early intervention services for infants and toddlers birth to three that are at risk for developmental disability or have a delay or a diagnosed disability. California's system is a multi-agency approach. The lead agency in California is the Department of Developmental Services and they work in close cooperation with the Department of Education. The Individuals With Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), which used to be the Education of the Handicapped Act only addressed services down to age 3 until 1987, when it became clear that there was a need to provide services earlier based on research. California jumped on the bandwagon and designated the Department of Developmental Services as the lead agency to implement Part H, now Part C, of the IDEA.

In this system, California is now providing early intervention services to more than 25,000 children birth to age 3. These services include such things as family training, counseling, occupational and physical therapy, psychological services, specialized instruction, speech and language services, and vision and hearing services. There is also an extensive network of family support services because we realize that the primary caregiver and supports received are a very important component of services. Family is very much a participant in the development of their child.

The packet of information Ms. Schoenborn provided for Legislative staff includes information on the federal law and state law that helps us implement the federal law. In California, we receive on an annual basis almost \$50 million from the federal government for the Early Start program. This is supplemental to the General Fund in California for the birth to 3 population. Regional centers allocate over \$100 million annually just for the purchase of services for children. This doesn't include California Department of Education costs or the case management and assessment costs. The federal funds are a very small portion of what California allocates to this program.

Regional Centers are the point of entry into the service system, not only for children under the age of three, but for all persons with developmental disabilities. Regional Centers are the access point for determining assessed needs and purchasing services. Education is a very large part of the program and collaboration between DDS and the Department of Education is very important because at age 3 when children exit the Early Start program it's determined if they are eligible for ongoing special education services. Under Early Start, children with low incidence disabilities are served by the Department of Education.

Families are a very important part of the Early Start system. California uses federal money to support a network of Family Resource Centers, which provide family-to-family support, peer counseling, information and referral and dissemination, language accessibility, and advocacy support in developing family service plans. Part of federal statute requires each state to have an Interagency Coordinating Council (ICC) that provides advice and assistance to the lead agency. Other departments participate to provide collaboration around provision of services to children. California's ICC includes

the Department of Social Services, Department of Health Services, Mental Health, Alcohol and Drug Programs and Education as well as parents of children with disabilities and providers of early intervention services.

Another component is the comprehensive system of personnel development. Support to persons who are providing services, indirect services and service coordination is available through institutes and training events. Ms. Schoenborn also provided information about the Early Start Child Find and public awareness efforts as well as information about the tremendous amount of resource materials maintained at the Early Start Resource Library through the DDS contract with WestEd Center for Prevention and Early Intervention.

Early intervention services can be provided at the child care setting. Child care is not an early intervention service provided by Early Start, however it may be considered a family support service provided by Regional Centers to ensure that children with disabilities can live with their families.

The Role of the Subsidized Sector, Michael Jett

The Department of Education administers four types of child care programs. Mr. Jett provided a brief overview of those programs, the Legislative intent in establishing them and the resources that go into them. The first program, Children's Center Programs, were established in 1943 as the result of federal legislation, the Lanham Act, which passed in 1942. The purpose of that program was to provide child care services to women working in industry during the war. It was decided that those programs would be administered by CDE and would be operated by school districts. Interestingly, they served children from age two to 16, twelve hours per day, six days per week. The focus at that time was care and supervision. In 1946, the federal dollars ended but California took over funding and the program became the State Child Care Center Program. It is worth noting that California was the only state to continue the program without federal funding, although, New York City did as well. The funding at that point was about \$3.5 million. In 1965, the concept of child care was expanded to include education and social services and be clear about the school-readiness emphasis of the programs. In 1972 the Child Development Act was passed and served to articulate the dual purposes of the programs; first, to help children prepare for later success in school, and secondly is to allow parents to work or obtain an education.

In 1980, the Child Care and Development Services Act consolidated all of the old programs into the General Child Care and Development Program. In that program, we have \$617 million. There are some Family Child Care Home Networks in there too. We also have a Migrant Child Care and Development Program and it is the same as the General except that it gives priority to children of agricultural workers. We also administer a Campus Child Care and Development Program and a small program for children with severe disabilities, mostly in the Bay Area.

The second type of program that evolved through our department is the State Preschool Program. It was established in 1965 and focuses more on the first purpose, to provide

educational experiences to low income disadvantaged children, including children from non-English speaking families. This program was modeled after the Head Start program, which was established during that same timeframe. During the early 1990s this program was \$40 million. At this point it is \$314 million and is funded to serve 100,000 children.

The third kind of program type, Alternative Payment (AP) Programs, evolved in 1976 from pilot projects. The goals of the AP program were to maximize parental choice and to provide more child care at less cost to the state. Its emphasis was to provide parental choice to parents who work different types of shifts and prefer different kinds of care.

In 1997, the CalWORKs Child Care Program was created to provide ongoing child care for recipients as they transitioned from welfare to work. This represented the merging of the two major streams of child care funding in the state, the education child care and the welfare child care that mostly came through the Department of Social Services as Title IV-A or the old GAIN child care. At present the General AP program that existed prior to CalWORKs is about \$212 million, Stage 1 is about \$460 million, Stage 2 is about \$639 million, Stage 3 is about \$359 million and we have a reserve of about \$108 million.

The fourth program type, after school programs, have existed since the beginning in our Children's Center Programs as Title 5 Programs. We also have the Latchkey Program, which has less educational requirements for teachers and is funded at \$30 million. In the late 1990's, the Before and After School Learning and Safe Neighborhood Partnership Program was established as strictly an after school program that blends academic support and enrichment activities. The program is at \$121 million this year. This is the year also that the Federal Government shifted 21st Century After School Programs that used to be funded directly, like Head Start, to the State Education agency. This program and Proposition 49 are both patterned after the before and after school program. Proposition 49 will have first call on new money when the economy improves and will take that program from \$121 million to a threshold of \$550 million.

In terms of the kinds of resources devoted to these programs, the State budget is about \$99 billion this year and the Child Development Division program funding alone totals \$2.3 billion. If you add the other CDE and DSS programs you get over \$3.2 billion, or slightly over three percent of the state budget is in early education and child care programs. In the future you can add to that the 21st Century programs, which are not in that figure; Proposition 49, which hasn't been implemented; and CalSAFE, the old SAPID program for pregnant teens and teen parents.

The role of subsidized care continues to be to focus on early learning and development for children and to support parents in achieving their goals for working and obtaining an education. Three currents have evolved to meet the needs of children. The AP CalWORKs system, which is on one end of workforce support continuum and has had continuous need for growth and additional resources over the past several years. The early childhood education centers and preschool programs, which place more emphasis

on the school readiness of children. And, the after school programs, which have evolved with the dual focus of academic support and providing a place for children to be other than home alone or out on the street in situations that place them at risk.

Importance of Child Care to Grandparents, Evelyn Mason

The population of grandparents raising grandchildren, or relative caregivers, was documented at 2.2 million nationally two months ago. Legislation has been enacted in California that now requires Aunts, Uncles, and Grandparents to bring their homes up to the same standards required of Foster Parents. This is creating a great hardship for these relative caregivers who are having to take out loans so they can add on rooms to their homes. Many of these grandparents will have to seek employment to pay off these loans and will require child care so they can work. This adds additional stress to these relative caregivers. It also raises issues about who is eligible to receive child care assistance.

I had one child who went to center-based child care, early intervention and special education and it was not detected until she was age 12 that she was mildly retarded with poor vision and other problems. It was encouraging to hear about the programs today. I have been discussing the need to educate Grandparents about how to identify the special needs of children and the resources and support available to them. Many children suffer due to lack of awareness of what is available. There is a group in Los Angeles called TASC, Team of Advocates for Special Children. We are conducting classes at community colleges to educate relatives but we can't get them out there because they can't afford child care. We have had some help through Crystal Stairs but resources are limited and people end up on long waiting lists. Younger Grandparents, those in their 40's, need child care and support so that they can remain employed and support their grandchildren. AARP and some of the other sources of support for those over 55 are not available to these caregivers and they often jeopardize their employment having to take the children to medical, counseling and school appointments. Many of the older Grandparents who are seeking health care end up taking their Grandchildren with them because they are not able to find or afford child care.

Child Care and School Readiness, Marie Poulsen, Ph.D.

Quality child care enhances school readiness for children at risk. As an example, to make it concrete, we'll look at readiness for reading from a child's point of view. It is more than just knowing the ABC's. When you think about it, a young one goes to school and is confronted by 26 forms, which we call letters; and 44 different sounds, which we call phonemes. They are asked to make an attachment between that sound and the form and blend them together to come up with what we call a word and then they are supposed to know the meaning of that word. This is very hard work and it can be particularly difficult for children who are at risk for a variety of biological or psychosocial circumstances.

I'm not going to talk about understanding the meaning of a word. We know that children who come from language-enriched environments will understand the meaning of the

words they put together, and we know that quality child care teachers match language to the experience of the child to help them learn. I want to stress the arduous task it is for a young child to learn to decode. It requires a young child to attend when they are very easily distracted; to persist when they are easily discouraged and to concentrate when they may be worried about things going on in their lives. What we are really looking at is that quality child care creates learners. Learning how to learn requires that attention, persistence and concentration.

Recent brain research has demonstrated the impact that certain psychosocial and biological circumstances can have on a child that affect his capacity to attend, to persist and to concentrate. We also know that there are certain parts of the brain that regulate emotions and behavior. We know, through new ways of assessing stress in a child using saliva, that chronic circumstances can cause their stress levels to remain high. We also know that very low birth weight, iron deficient anemia, under nutrition, domestic violence, childhood trauma and caregiver neglect all lead to heightened levels of stress hormones and may lead to development of patterns of acting that keep them hyper-vigilant so they can not attend to the tasks within the school. Now we need to look at what is happening with our children and California.

The *2002 Children's Report Card* by Children Now reports the following: 6.2 percent of infants are born low birth weight – they may need extra help; 25 percent of low income children have iron deficient anemia, which really can affect the regulation of behavior; 25 percent of families experience food insecurity and 10 percent of those children actually experience hunger; 330,000 children witness domestic violence; 172,000 children under 6 are reported for abuse or neglect, and 28,440 children under 6 are currently in Foster Care. These are all children who may be experiencing their life in a way that precludes them from easily attending and easily concentrating or easily persisting.

Just as there is science that tells us about these negative consequences, there is also science that tells us the role that nurturing caregiving has in lowering the stress hormone and in helping the child develop patterns that then become resilient patterns of behavior rather than at-risk patterns of behavior. So, risk is not destiny when we have quality child care that supports building resilience in children at risk and therefore supports success in school. The components of quality child care are: Nurturing caregiver relationships - in the appropriate adult/child ratio; healthy nutrition; experiential opportunity and support and of course experiential opportunity in the mind of a preschooler is play. There is a saying in child development that most of our kids grow in spite of us rather than because of us, but that supposes that we have healthy, robust children in healthy robust families. A child at risk does not learn incidentally by being provided opportunities; we need to coach. Quality child care providers coach as well as providing opportunities. Fundamental to this are the family partnerships so there is similarity between expectations and developmental guidance at home and in the child care centers, and this all depends on caregiver training and support and caregiver pay equity. Quality child care prepares the child for school by building resilience in our kids who are at risk.

Collaboration Between Health Programs and Child Care, Dr. Robert Bates

Dr. Bates began with a quiz. He listed a number of things, including: communicable disease and immunizations, preventing early childhood tooth decay carries, preventing SIDS, managing asthma in the preschool setting, access to medical care and prevention services; medical care for children with special health care needs; injury prevention (motor vehicle crashes and drownings); domestic violence detection and prevention, supporting health needs of African Americans, detecting and preventing genetic diseases; providing good nutrition; lead poisoning prevention; childhood health consultation. The question is:

- a) Is this a list of issues important to child care providers?
- b) Is this a list of issues important to public health care programs?
- c) Is this a list of issues important to both?

Clearly, the answer is C. One could then assume that there is a great deal of collaboration between public health programs and child care programs. While there is a fair amount, it's mainly between local health departments and licensed child care. The quality and quantity has varied a great deal in different communities and jurisdictions. In the past it was mostly around specific categorical issues, e.g., immunization programs that included child care providers or lead poisoning prevention programs. There really wasn't wide-scale appreciation for the commonality of the issues until Prop 10 required community needs assessments and provided a funding source. As they say, you haven't seen collaboration until you throw \$650 million on the table, which is what Prop 10 did. Because of the local Prop 10 process, there has been a lot of good collaboration at the local level. Where the deficiency has been is at the state level. I think that the state health programs haven't fully seen opportunities to support the local collaboration that is going on. I think the state needs a process similar to what the counties did locally. There is a small federal grant DHS is looking at now to assist in this collaboration and a committee such as the Child Development Policy Advisory Committee would be one of the key partners. It is this kind of group, with its broad representation that can really make that kind of process work, because if you had to start from scratch, it would be very difficult. With this kind of multidisciplinary group working with others around the state, I really think we might be able to do some meaningful state-level collaboration.

Proposition 10, Joyce De Witt & Joyce Hanson

Joyce Hanson is a Commissioner on the Orange County Prop 10 Commission. As Dr. Bates mentioned, there are wonderful examples of collaboration at the local level. The way the local commissions are structured promotes that kind of collaboration and is different than the way the State Commission is structured. She believes CDPAC's structure is one that promotes state-level collaboration. Both the State and local commissions are the result of the Children and Families Act of 1998 that established a 50 cent sales tax on cigarettes and other tobacco products. The revenues were to be spent for new and expanded programs in education, health, child care and child development. They were not to supplant existing programs, which is very important in this year of the budget. Twenty percent of the money goes to the state commission and

80 percent went to the 58 county commissions. Allocations were based on birth statistics using the mother's county of residence. There are seven members of the State commission and they took a very strong stand on diversity and established an advisory committee on diversity to ensure that programs meet the needs of Californians ethnically, culturally, and linguistically. Children with disabilities and other special needs are also a very important population this committee wants to ensure are considered in all programs and activities. The state commission does the mass media campaign, education, research and development and administration. The State Commission initiatives are School Readiness, Retention Incentives for Early Care and Education Providers, the kit for new parents, and the statewide program evaluation. The County Commissions are comprised of 5 to 9 members appointed by the Board of Supervisors. Before the County Commissions could expend any funds, they developed strategic plans that would have maximum flexibility to tailor their plans to the local community. Local plans included lots of input. All expenditures must tie to the plan. County Commissions fund programs according to local plans that meet the specific needs of children and families within that County. Most County Commissions are independent of their local Boards of Supervisors. Funds are not part of the General Fund, which is very important in a year like this one.

Joyce DeWitt is pleased to be the last speaker on such an informative panel. She described differences and similarities between CDPAC and First 5, as Prop 10 is now called. First, CDPAC is not new, having been established in 1965 by legislation declaring that the Committee was to provide public policy recommendations to the Governor, the legislature and relevant state departments concerning child development. The Committee's intent is to encourage child development policies that are long-range, developmentally appropriate and socially advanced. We generally have nine meetings each year and they are all open to the public. We have ad hoc subcommittees that do the work and very often we work as a committee of the whole. Another difference between First 5 and CDPAC is that we are advisory in nature. We do not tell programs how to do something, we provide information, data or whatever we might be called upon to do. Another significant difference is that First 5 has millions of dollars and CDPAC has about \$300,000 to function. When you think about what has come out of this Committee over the past years, you will appreciate the depth of work that comes from such a small group.

As a committee, CDPAC has undergone many changes, but our mandate has not changed, and that is to provide information and advice on what would be good in terms of policy for children and families. When I think of the things that stand out in my mind about the work of the Committee, one is collaboration. We collaborate, as you can see from the state agency and private sector representatives here at each meeting. We have provided many wonderful and exciting things such as the Transfer of Knowledge Symposium, opportunities for Local Planning Councils to come together as a growing new group, and as mandated by our role with the Department of Education, we have provided technical assistance and leadership.

I am very pleased that CDPAC has been able to bring forward emerging trends and bring forth new public research. I love being able to say that people look at California as a leader in many of the issues and it is depressing that we are less and less able to do that. CDPAC provides the only public forum or citizen's advisory review board where people can come and exchange ideas and provide the kind of input that we need to pass on to our Legislators. One little-known fact is that in California, CDPAC is the repository of decades of early childhood education information. You can go back to the Committee's inception to find out what has happened. For me CDPAC is an opportunity to give back to the community. I'd also like to share with you that CDPAC members serve on their own time and for the most part at their own expense. We do so out of commitment to providing this public forum on the important issue of child care.

CDPAC has a rich history and have had great leaders, from Vivian Weinstein to our current chair. CDPAC is the place where can provide the kind of information that people might need without having a vested interest. CDPAC crosses the lines and works with DSS, CDE, DHS, DDS and EDD as well as the private sector. I'd like to call your attention to the "CDPAC Achievements" sheet in your packets. There is, I hope, a long future for this Committee, because it is the only group in California that says we care about young children, their families and what happens to child care. We need to get on to do our work, not rest in the past, but to move on to the future.

More information on all of the topics discussed here today is available at the CDPAC office and much of it is on our web site. We hope you will continue to use us as a resource.

Kathy wished all a Holiday season that is as exciting as you can bear and as restful as you need.

Meeting Adjournment

ATTENDEES AT DECEMBER 5, 2002 CDPAC MEETING

Committee Members:

Kathleen Malaske-Samu, Chairperson
Evelyn Mason, Grandparent/ Child Advocate/Consultant
Joyce Hanson, Grandparent/Child Advocate
Marie Kanne Poulsen, USC Children's Hospital
Bonnie Parks, Employment Development Department
Cheri Schoenborn, Department of Developmental Services

Venus Garth, CA. Dept of Social Services
Joyce De Witt, Public Member
Earl Peterson, Child Care Consultant
Robert Bates, Department of Health Services
Michael Jett, CDD/CDE
Amy Tan, Sacramento City College USD

Participant:

Ashley Krohn
Toshy Mayes
Mindy Ranstrom
Rachael Leaming
Patrick Jones
Derek Russell
Marcia Westbrook, CCCC of Nevada County
Marie L. Murata, CDD, CDE
April Befumo, Stanislaus County LPC
Robert Sifuentes, State Council on Developmental Disabilities
Leilani Delos Reyes, PACE/APP
Elissa Provance, West
Francine Nunes, PCOE/Placer County Child Care LPC
Kim Relph, CDSS, Child Care
Deana Carrillo, California Budget Project
Barbara Coulibaly-Robinson, PACE/APP
Edward Condon, California Head Start Association
Brentt Brown, Natl. Economic Development and Law Ctr
Jennifer Martin-Lopez, ECD Extension
Susan Jensen, California Child Care Health Program
Edwin Warren, Warren Edmunds & Associates, LLC
Ken Larson, California Association of Nonprofits
Karen Adams, Welfare Action
Laura Ivans, City of Davis Child Care Services
Brad Thornton, Shane's Inspiration

Toni Clevery
Nicole Pandolfe
Rachel Gordon
Camila Silva
Matt Jilarp
Dee Cuney, Private Child Care Network
Linda Parfitt, CDD, CDE
Marilyn Rotnem, Merced County LPC
Vera Nicholas, California State Library
Matthew Marsom, Department of Health Services
Alex Cooke, On The Capitol Doorstep
Linda Wherry, Travis AFB Child Development Ctr
Maisee Thao, LA County Office of Education
Irma Fraigun, California Teachers Association
Melinda Waring, Yolo County LPC
Kathi Walker, El Dorado County LPC
Heather Lang, Bananas
Joyce Stone, Child Action, Inc.
Louise Boley
Scott Graves, California Budget Project
Maria Hernandez, CDSS
Barbara Fields, Welfare Action
Marie Saur, CDSS
Tiffany Harris, Shane's Inspiration
Robert Siffueantes

Staff:

Kay Ryan, Executive Director
Sharon Rea Zone, Analyst
Priscilla Jong

Sharron Goldstein, Analyst
Leslie Witten-Rood, Analyst
Alex Castillon